

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, 26 and 27 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-10 and 22-28 are rejected. Claims 22-25 and 28 have been cancelled. Claims 26 and 27 have been amended. Claims 11-21 are allowed. The specification and drawings stand as filed.

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the aforementioned Office Action is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. The basis for the amendments can be found throughout the Specification, Claims and Drawings as originally filed.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to their representative, Donald G. Walker, during a telephonic interview conducted on December 22, 2004. During the interview, the § 112 rejections were discussed. Agreement was reached that the phrase "said drive pin" in claim 2 does not lack antecedent basis and that the phrase "the first pin" in claim 27 would be amended to read --the first rod--. Furthermore, the Examiner agreed that claim 1 and claim 7 are not vague, indefinite or confusingly worded.

U.S. Patent No. 6,786,478 to Pavlik et al. was discussed in view of the rejections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Applicants and the Examiner agreed that Pavlik does not disclose a clamping arm that is rotatable about an axis substantially parallel to a longitudinal axis of the locating pin. As such, the Examiner agreed to allow the rejected claims including this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the amendments to be entered and the case allowed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that proper antecedent basis is provided for the phrase "said drive pin" in claim 2, line 2 by the phrase "a drive pin" in claim 2, line 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejection. With regard to claim 27, Applicants have amended claim 27 to call for the "first rod" at line 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejection.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim as initially presented is not vague, indefinite or confusingly worded. Specifically, Applicants point the Examiner's attention to paragraph 3 where claim 1 recites "a clamping arm rotatable about an axis substantially parallel to said longitudinal axis." Figures 4 and 6 clearly depict clamping arm 28 as being rotatable about pin 122. Pin 122 extends substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of locating pin 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 112 rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7-10 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pavlik et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,786,478).

With regard to claims 1 and 7-10, Applicants respectfully submit that Pavlik et al. does not disclose a clamping arm rotatable about an axis substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of a locating pin. On the contrary, Pavlik et al. discloses a clamping arm that is radially translatable through perforation 67. Finger 60 is radially movable

into and out of locating pin 12 through perforation 67, transversely to axis A of locating pin 12 (Col. 5, lines 36-47). Each finger 60 of Pavlik et al. includes a slot 64 in communication with a dowel 86 extending axially from central post 70. Rotation of central post 70 causes each finger 60 to radially translate. However, fingers 60 do not rotate about an axis substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the locating pin. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejections.

Applicants have cancelled claims 22-25. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

With reference to claim 28, Applicants respectfully submit that Pavlik et al. does not disclose a method of operating a clamp including rotating the clamping member about an axis offset from and substantially parallel to an axis about which the actuator is translated. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejection to claim 28. To expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 26 to include the limitations of arguably allowable claim 28. Based on this amendment, Applicants have cancelled originally filed claim 28.

CONCLUSION

All of the grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding office action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If it is believed that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600. Prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated December 22, 2004

By Donald G. Walker
Donald G. Walker – Reg. No. 44390
Attorneys for Applicants

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P. O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
Phone: 248/641-1600
Facsimile: 248/641-0270

DGW/jmm